

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
9 **SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

10 ANDREW CEJAS,

11 Plaintiff,

12 v.

13 DANIEL PARAMO, Warden, et al.,

14 Defendants.

CASE NO. 14-cv-1923-WQH-WVG

ORDER

15 HAYES, Judge:

16 The matter before the Court is the review of the Report and Recommendation
17 issued by United States Magistrate Judge recommending that the motion for preliminary
18 injunction filed by Plaintiff (ECF No. 46) be denied. (ECF No. 73).

19 The duties of the district court in connection with a report and recommendation
20 of a magistrate judge are set forth in Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 72(b) and 28
21 U.S.C. § 636(b). The district judge must “make a de novo determination of those
22 portions of the report . . . to which objection is made,” and “may accept, reject, or
23 modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate.”
24 28 U.S.C. § 636(b). The district court need not review de novo those portions of a
25 Report and Recommendation to which neither party objects. *See Wang v. Masaitis*, 416
26 F.3d 992, 1000 n.13 (9th Cir. 2005); *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114, 1121
27 (9th Cir. 2003) (en banc) (“Neither the Constitution nor the [Federal Magistrates Act]
28 requires a district judge to review, de novo, findings and recommendations that the

1 parties themselves accept as correct.”).

2 The Court has reviewed the Report and Recommendation, the record, and the
3 submissions of the parties. No objections have been filed. The Court adopts the Report
4 and in its entirety.

5 **III. Conclusion**

6 IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 73)
7 is adopted in its entirety. The motion for preliminary injunction (ECF No. 46) is
8 denied.

9 DATED: August 13, 2018

10 
11 **WILLIAM Q. HAYES**
12 United States District Judge
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28